

Chapter 26

Gavin Douglas's *Eneados*

Nicola Royan

The *Eneados* is, by any reckoning, an astonishing piece of work. It is the first complete translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* into any form of English; in his attempt to transmit Virgil's greatness, Gavin Douglas uses five stress couplets and wrestles to produce close and comprehensible meaning, and to stay as faithful to his base text as possible. Attached to the translation are twelve prologues, in which Douglas seeks to provide guides to reading and a gloss on the difficulties of each book, as well as explanations of his own approach. To some readers, these prologues and the inclusion of a thirteenth book with its own prologue have been evidence for Douglas's 'medieval' outlook, an outlook where pagan gods need still to be justified and where Virgil's text was often considered unfinished.¹ Yet, the whole work also seems to embody humanist endeavour in its asserted desire to make Virgil accessible to those unlearned in Latin. It is a key text in classical reception in Britain, and deserves to be better known.

Life and Historical Contexts

Even had he not been a poet of distinction, Gavin Douglas would still have had his place in Scottish history. His father, Archibald, the fifth Earl of Angus, was an important magnate in the reigns of James III and James IV, supporting James IV in deposing his father, but arguing against war with England in 1512–13.² The poet's nephew, another

Archibald, married James IV's widow, Margaret Tudor, and was intermittently and unsuccessfully regent for the young James V during the 1520s. The poet himself sought a career in the Church, becoming Provost of St Giles in Edinburgh by 11 March 1503, and finally confirmed bishop of Dunkeld in 1516.³ As a prominent churchman, Gavin Douglas would have had some influence in his own right; however, his aristocratic and powerful background both propelled his promotion and determined his particular contribution to Scottish politics. The Douglas name had been prominent in Scottish affairs since the Wars of Independence in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; while Gavin Douglas sprang from the Red Douglas kin rather than the Black, his family name remained closely associated with political power, sometimes in opposition to the crown, throughout the sixteenth century.⁴ Legal and epistolary records indicate that the poet was much concerned with family and political affairs; his first poem, *The Palice of Honoure* (c.1501), is dedicated to James IV, and has been read as both a quest for patronage and a work of advice. Although the precise nature of the politics of the *Eneados* is much debated, there is at least some agreement that Douglas's particular circumstances and aristocratic milieu are significant in its interpretation.⁵

Gavin Douglas was born c.1476, the third son of the Earl of Angus and his wife Elizabeth Boyd, most probably at the family's stronghold at Tantallon; the scholastic philosopher John Mair refers to him as a fellow inhabitant of East Lothian (Mair was born in Haddington).⁶ Records indicate that he matriculated at the University of St Andrews in 1490, and that he became a licentiate or master of arts in 1494. As a younger son, he was probably destined early for a career in the Church and his preferment in the Church was assisted by his birth and by royal favour. In the 1490s, he was associated

with two benefices, the deanery of Dunkeld and the parsonage of Glenholm: the first of these was contested, the second provisional, and it is not until 1503 that Douglas became provost of St Giles, and 1504 that he became parson of Linton, near Tantallon, and a canon of the collegiate church at Dunbar. As provost, he appears to have engaged with a common round of refurbishment and enlargement, and also in work both ecclesiastical and secular, whether binding himself to celebrate the mass of the holy blood, or being present at the lords of council, or being appointed to counsel the rector of St Andrews University. He translated the *Aeneid* during his provostship, and in the text he dates its completion to ‘the fest of Mary Magdalen | Fra Crystis byrth, the dait quha lyst to heir | A thousand fyve hundreth and thretteyn yeir’.⁷ Already at the end of the *Eneados*, there is some evidence that Douglas is moving away from verse into ‘grave materis’. Such a move was doubtless driven faster in the aftermath of Flodden on 9 September 1513, for not only did Douglas lose his older brothers in that battle, but also his king. Douglas’s father died in November 1513, leaving Douglas’s nephew Archibald as Earl. The last seven years of Douglas’s life, his difficulties in seeking further advancement and his eventual appointment as bishop of Dunkeld, his support of his nephew’s various political endeavours and his eventual exile and death in England in 1522 (from plague), clearly do not influence the composition of the *Eneados*; they may, however, raise questions about its reception and circulation, discussed at the very end of this chapter.

Education and Intellectual Circles

Although there is clear evidence of Douglas’s study at the University of St Andrews, no records survive to prove that he followed the path of many of his countrymen to the

Continent for further study and a higher degree. However, John Mair describes him as having shared his studies in both Scotland and France, and he might either have spent time in Paris in the later 1490s, or in the first decade of the sixteenth century, after he achieved his benefices.⁸ He would have been in good company: as well as Mair, other Scots in Paris in the 1490s included Hector Boece, whose humanist account of Scottish history is a key source for ‘Holinshed’, and John Vaus, a distinguished Latin grammarian, while students of Mair’s in the 1500s included David Cranstoun, Douglas’s interlocutor in one of Mair’s dialogues.⁹ While none of these men had anything approaching Douglas’s social status, nor indeed the international reputation of Mair, nevertheless, their surviving work demonstrates the interaction between scholastic and humanist practice then current in Paris, and brought back to Scotland. Despite the evident connection between Douglas and Mair, Douglas’s associations with other Scots in Paris, or indeed in Scottish universities other than St Andrews, are only circumstantial, such as the prominence of the Flemish printer Jodocus Badius Ascensius in Scottish circles, in Douglas’s use of his 1501 edition of the *Aeneid* as a base text, and in his printing of various Scottish-authored material including histories by both Mair and Boece. Nevertheless, it seems safe to assume that Douglas was comfortable in scholarly circles, aware of current intellectual debates in Paris, and familiar with humanist concerns about the accuracy of the text.

Without doubt, Douglas was well read. His competence in Latin, and his familiarity with the *Aeneid* and ability in interpreting the Virgilian commentary tradition that accompanied it, are both evident in the *Eneados*. In *The Palice of Honoure*, he lists a variety of writers and texts visible in Calliope’s court. Despite the element of self-

aggrandizement in this list, Douglas would have been familiar with classical writers such as Juvenal, Martial, Ovid, Quintilian, and Lucan, as well as Donatus, Servius, and Boethius, and he would also have read works by Lorenzo Valla, Boccaccio, and Fausto Andrelini. A manuscript of Valla's *Elegantiaelinguae Latinae* appears in the library of William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, while Archibald Whitelaw, archdeacon of Lothian, owned print copies of Lucan, Horace, and Sallust: both these men were senior government officers, Elphinstone as chancellor to James IV, and Whitelaw as secretary to James III, and would have been well known to Douglas's father, and quite probably to Douglas himself.¹⁰ Douglas was also deeply familiar with the vernacular tradition, both in Older Scots and English: in *The Palice of Honoure* lists distinguished practitioners (Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, Dunbar, and Walter Kennedy) together with the Latin writers, and mentions Robert Henryson in one of his marginal notes to the *Eneados* as well as evoking his *Moral Fabillis* and *The Testament of Cresseid* in the *Eneados* prologues. Although Douglas rails against Chaucer in the prologues, he nevertheless adopts Chaucerian metre (five-stress couplets) for the translation, and is acutely aware of the authorial questions that Chaucer raises. Douglas's engagement with Older Scots writing is most obvious in the prologues as well: verse forms, style, and vocabulary are also absorbed from poetic predecessors. The dedicatee of the translation, Henry, Lord Sinclair, belonged to a notably bookish family, and Sinclair himself owned a significant manuscript miscellany of English and Scottish verse. Although Douglas might have hoped for some reward from Sinclair for the translation, the relationship is not quite articulated as one of patronage, but more one of common interest. Unfortunately, Sinclair

was also killed at Flodden, so we have no sense of how the dedication was received: the kind of patronage he offered did not reappear in Scotland for several decades.

These overlapping intellectual circles matter in assessing Douglas's putative audience for the *Eneados* and the effect that has on the translation. Unlike his contemporaries Mair and Boece, and indeed his predecessors like Whitelaw, Douglas's literary works are all in the vernacular, and in current scholarship, he is most commonly approached and discussed as a vernacular poet rather than as a humanist scholar or even as a translator. That is perhaps attributable to the relative inaccessibility of the translation, both physically and intellectually: fewer people are now familiar with Virgil's Latin text, and the last full edition of the poem in its original language was printed by the Scottish Text Society in the 1960s. But approaching him as a vernacular poet gives the impression, on the one hand, that Douglas is exceptional as a mediator of classical literature to a less learned audience, and on the other hand, that his work is unoriginal. Yet, at the point of composition, the divide between Latin culture and vernacular culture would have looked entirely different. Despite Mair's condemnation of aristocratic illiteracy, a man like Sinclair, for instance, might well have been literate in Latin and able to read the *Aeneid*: it is likely that the Sinclair boys at least were taught to read by a household chaplain. An interest in vernacular verse does not preclude the reading of classical texts. Douglas's reading in one language and writing in another might also apply to Henryson, among others; earlier Scots translations tended to be from French. Inverting this model, scholars writing primarily or exclusively in Latin might nevertheless read vernacular verse and prose, and be expected to critique Douglas's translation, particularly given his claims towards accuracy. Consequently, the *Eneados* arises in a culture where

some (and some invisibly) read freely across languages and disciplines, and others (including those with other linguistic competencies) read their own literatures with sophistication. Although whether as a scholar or as a humanist, Douglas himself does not compare to John Mair, or indeed to George Buchanan, yet in his translation and its prologues, Douglas engages with both those cultural types, drawing on all kinds of material to interpret Virgil for his current age.

Nature of the Text

In form, Douglas's work is distinctive. As well as Virgil's text, Douglas translates a thirteenth book, by the humanist Maffeo Vegio (1407–58).¹¹ Douglas's decision to translate Vegio's supplementary book is often seen as an aberration. Yet the incomplete nature of the *Aeneid*, particularly its abrupt end with the slaughter of Turnus by Aeneas as an act of passionate revenge, was clearly troubling to many medieval and early modern readers. Vegio was not the only person to undertake to complete the *Aeneid*, and to provide the nation-building conclusion implied by some of its earlier books by presenting the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia. His composition, however, was particularly successful, circulating widely throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and it was, moreover, included in Badius' 1501 edition of the *Aeneid*, even though Badius (as repeated and translated by Douglas) describes it as 'a fift queill' ('fifth wheel').¹² Douglas, therefore, did not have to seek it out, but rather had it included in an authoritative Virgilian text. That he was not entirely comfortable in including it is evident from the prologue, but nonetheless, he did, and needed to negotiate a relationship to it.

Each book, including the thirteenth, has its own prologue: these act as commentaries on the books that follow, or the progression of the translation, and demonstrate Douglas's competence in a variety of poetic forms and metres. Douglas imposes chapter divisions on the translation. While these are arguably equivalent to the paragraphing undertaken by modern editors, nevertheless they make the text look and read quite differently, particularly as each chapter has a summary heading. As Bawcutt suggests, such an imposition 'makes sharp and discrete what is continuous and interwoven' in Virgil's Latin.¹³ That such a practice was seen as a legitimate means of providing navigation in long texts might be indicated by John Bellenden's translations of the first books of Livy's *Ab urbe condita* and the *Scotorum historia* a generation later;¹⁴ nevertheless, here they are an important indication of Douglas's willingness to assert control over his text, with the aim of determining an accurate reading of the overall themes of the *Aeneid*, even when that involves re-arranging the text itself.

The Prologues

The prologues are key to Douglas's reading of the *Aeneid* and his approaches when translating. They are now probably the best-known parts of the work, and some are regularly anthologized, such as the 'nature prologues' (Prologues VII and XII) and the prologue to Book I.¹⁵ The 'nature' prologues are particularly attractive because of Douglas's correlation of the seasons with the act of translation and with the progress of work. Prologue VII marks the halfway point in the project, and its winter setting reflects both the serious events of Book VI that precede it, and the effort involved in continuing the work. Douglas's evocation of 'schowris snell' and 'snyband snaw' ('bitter showers,

sniping snow', Prol. VII. 43, 50) and 'euery hie way | Full of floschis, dubbis, myre and clay' ('every highway, full of watery swamps, puddles, mire and dirt', Prol. VII. 53–4) is conventionally close to Scottish winters. Such descriptions are made more pointed by the pathos of human endeavour, in such lines as 'The silly scheip and thar litil hyrd gromys | lurkis vndre le of bankis, woddis and bromys' ('The silly sheep and their little herd boys lurk under lea of banks, woods and bushes' (Prol. VII. 77–8)). Douglas portrays himself as driven to bed by the cold and reluctant to rise, but driven to return to work by the sight of the *Aeneid* on his lectern. He concludes the prologue by comparing his endeavour to ploughing and himself as '[f]ull laith to leif our wark swa in the myre | or 3it to stynt for bitter storm or rane' ('Reluctant to leave our work thus in the mud | or yet to stop for bitter storm or rain' (Prol. VII. 156–7)). Implicitly such a comparison marks Douglas's work as essential and productive; it also marks it as hard.

Prologue XII in contrast marks the beginning of the end of the translation of Virgil's text, and features the poet in spring. There are elements of direct response to Prologue VII. Both, for instance, deploy classical references to set their landscapes: Prologue XII begins with Dyonea, while Prologue VII begins with Phoebus. However, Dyonea, the 'nycht hyrd and wach of day' ('night guardian and watch for day'), is chased away by the stars, opening the poem at dawn, while Prologue VII's Phoebus was setting. Such a pattern of opposition is continued in references to temperature, weather, and colour: the ground is 'fadyt' ('faded') in Prol VII. 37, while in Prologue XII it is 'enbrovd with selcouth hewys' ('Embroidered with several colours': Prol. XII. 65). The landscape is more comfortably populated by both people and animals, and Douglas too is a more enthusiastic riser, getting up before mass to begin the twelfth book. Together, the

prologues form a pair, not simply of different seasons, but also as mirrors of one another, in the ways in which Douglas intermeshes classical trope with apparently local detail, and the ways of the outside world with the experiences of writing and translating.

The practice of anthologizing the prologues began early, with George Bannatyne selecting Prologues IV, IX, and X for his miscellany,¹⁶ and has been a consistent feature of the reception of the *Eneados*. However, more recent criticism has emphasized their significance for understanding the translation.¹⁷ Discussions have pointed out the seasonal patterns brought out to describe the progress of the translation, and also the ways in which the prologues engage with particular issues. For instance, Prologue VI negotiates a Christian reading for the account of the pagan underworld that follows, while Prologue IV examines love and its effects on Dido, emphasizing her appetites and the destructive power of love.¹⁸ More salient here, however, are the discussions of literary authority and the responsibilities of translation presented in the prologues to Books 1 and 13.

The prologue to Book I is probably best known for its assertion that the *Eneados* is ‘writtin in the langage of Scottis natioun’ (Prol. I. 103), one of the first points at which this northern variety of English is given a national identity. Douglas further develops this in his attack on Caxton, where Caxton’s crime of translating the *Eneydos* from French is compounded by his Englishness (Prol. I. 138–43). Chaucer also comes under Douglas’s attack, less for his Englishness and more for his misinterpretation of Aeneas’ treatment of Dido. Douglas rates himself with reference to Chaucer, but also Chaucer with reference to Virgil: ‘as he [Chaucer] standis beneth Virgill in gre, | Vndir hym alsfer I grant my self to be’ (‘as he stands beneath Virgil in degree, so I grant myself to be under him’, Prol. I.

407–8). Nevertheless, in Douglas’s view, Chaucer’s vindication of Dido ‘gretly Virgill offendit’ (Prol. I. 410), because it implies that Aeneas was forsworn, something which Virgil is at pains to deny. Douglas’s assertions here are of course open to challenge, especially because of Chaucer’s own complicated and conscious syntheses of classical material, especially Virgil and Ovid, but the representation of Dido can be seen as Douglas’ marker for the difference and accuracy of his translation.

Douglas primarily uses lexis as a metonym for the practical difficulties of translation, particularly from Latin, with its high status, into Scots:

Bot ȝit twyching our tungis penuryte	yet, touching	tongues’
poverty		
I meyn into compar of fair Latyn	mean	in comparison with
That knawyn is maste perfite langage fyne	known	most perfect language
fine		
I mycht also percace cum lyddir speid	might	perchance making
slow progress		
For ‘arbor’ and ‘lignum’ intill our leid		into our language
To fynd different proper termys twane		two proper terms
And tharto put circumlocutioun nane.		none

(Prol I. 380–6)

This is partly figured as an issue for Scots, as Douglas has to borrow words from English, or from ‘bastard Latyn’ (Prol I, 117) or French. However, it is also an endemic problem in translation, since being bound to a text is ‘far strater’ (‘far more limiting’ (Prol I. 290))

than being free to write whatever you like, and Douglas is keen to ensure that he remains as close to Virgil's text as possible:

Quha is attachit ontill a staik, we se, Who to a stake
May go na ferthir bot wreil about that tre: Cannot further turn about
that tree

Rycht so am I to Virgillis text ybund. Bound

(Prol. I. 297–302)

In outlining the problems with particular words, Douglas draws attention to the need to construe meaning rather than simply words. Such a task is for the learned, even though the avowed audience is composed of those of much simpler education. To convey such meaning to such an audience, Douglas reserves the right to explain, to incorporate other interpretations. In theory, it allows Douglas to claim multiple authorities, and himself as a conduit for the greater meaning of this essential yet difficult text. In practice, in the earliest witness, there are marginal notes, explaining points in the passage:¹⁹ for instance, an explanation of Achates from I.vi.15, 'Mony expondis Achates for thochtfull cuyr or sollicitud, quhilk all tymys is feyr and companieon to princis and gret men' ('Many explain Achates as thoughtful care or solicitude, which at all times is friend and companion to princes and great men'). These appear to be Douglas's own comments, although the note to Prol I. 437, 'Heir he argouis better than befoir' ('Here he argues better than before') might suggest that the scribe, Douglas's secretary Matthew Geddes, also had opinions. However, these notes cease in Book I. There remains, however, Douglas's other practice, of including explanatory material in his translation. For instance, in Book VII, Douglas classifies for his readers exactly the bird into which Picus

is changed: ‘a byrd . . . | With sprutlyt weyngis, clepit a Speicht with ws, | Quhilk in Latyn hait Pycus Marcyus’ (‘a bird . . . with speckled wings, called a Speicht with us | which in Latin is called Picus Marcius’ (VII. iii. 90–2)). This interpretation loses Virgil’s image of Circe sprinkling the wings (*Aen* 7. 191), so here Douglas has chosen clarity over poetic closeness. Not all of the glosses are quite so striking, but Douglas does present what Douglas Gray describes as ‘commentator’s twitch’, perhaps appropriate at least to the school masters he envisages as part of his audience.²⁰

If the prologue to Book I introduces the difficulties of translating the *Aeneid*, the prologue to Book XIII has to make a different sort of case. Given Douglas’s insistence on the primacy of Virgil’s text and meaning in the prologue to Book I, to transfer that authority to another writer whose work supplements the *Aeneid* and, as has been argued, potentially displaces it, is challenging.²¹ From its opening, Prologue XIII advertises its difference from Prologue I. Where Douglas argues directly in his own voice in the opening account, identifying himself as distinct in nation and in aspiration, in Prologue XIII, he returns to self-projection, initially repeating the approach in Prologues VII and XII. As in Prologues VII and XII, Douglas locates the prologue in a season, here summer. While Prologues VII and XII present the narrator in his chamber, with one eye with Virgil’s book (for instance, Prol. VII. 155–8 and Prol. XII. 267–72), Prologue XIII takes him out into the landscape to experience a dream-vision. In this vision, he encounters Vegius (i.e. the humanist Vegio), ‘[l]yke to sum poet of the ald fasson [fashion]’ (Prol. XIII. 88); Vegius forces him by threat of violence to undertake the translation (Prol. XIII. 146–52). Douglas’s attitude to Vegius’ text is thus presented very differently: Virgil is not imagined beyond his text, and Douglas cannot approach him except through the book,

while Vegius can be given as much substance as Douglas gives his dream self—in short, his talent is comprehensible where Virgil’s is so much greater.²² We can therefore imagine Douglas as acutely conscious of his choices and of the nature of the texts, but nevertheless aiming for completeness.

The Translation of Virgil

Priscilla Bawcutt first argued that Douglas used Badius’ 1501 edition of the *Aeneid* as his base text, and subsequent work on the translation and its detail has confirmed this discovery.²³ This relationship is significant to any readings of the *Eneados*: at various points, some of Douglas’s apparent mistranslations arise directly from Badius’ text, such as the mispresentation of names in Book 2, 261–2, where Douglas has ‘Thersander’ and ‘Athamas’ following the 1501 text’s rendition, rather the more common modern readings of Thessandrus and Acamas.²⁴ At others, Douglas incorporates parts from the accompanying commentary to elucidate particular aspects of Virgil’s poem: for instance, at the very beginning of Book I, Douglas describes ‘Samos’ as Juno’s ‘native land’ (I.i.27); not present in Virgil’s text, this appears to derive from Ascensius’ commentary note, *Samo in qua nata dicitur*.²⁵ Douglas’s choice of Badius’ edition fits well with his presence around the Scots community in Paris; moreover, Badius’ avowed intention, to provide a commentary for students, with appropriate weighting on lexis and syntax, chimes with Douglas’s own.²⁶ Badius’ edition remained influential throughout the sixteenth century, perhaps because of its sheer wealth of helpful material.²⁷ Virgil’s text was hemmed in on the page by commentary, Servius’ below, beginning in the same column, and Badius’ adjacent.

Although indebted to Badius for his text and for particular interpretations, Douglas is not constrained by Badius' division of the text. Most obviously, his chapters do not correlate with Badius' sections in the 1501 text. More disruptive yet are the four occasions where Douglas alters the book divisions: *Eneados* II starts with *Aeneid* 2.10, VI starts with *Aeneid* 6.9, VII with *Aeneid* 7.25, VIII with *Aeneid* 8.18. Taking the first as an example, Douglas's division breaks a line. The Latin text reads:

sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros
et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem
quamquam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit,
incipiam. Fracti bello fatisque repulsi
ductores Danaum, tot iam labentibus annis
instar montis equum divina Palladis arte
aedificant, sectaque intexunt abiete costas;

(Yet if you have such longing to learn our disasters, and in few words to hear of Troy's last agony, though my mind shudders to remember, and has recoiled in grief, I will begin. Broken in war and thrust back by the fates, the Danaan chiefs, now that so many years were gliding by, build by Pallas' divine art a horse of mountainous bulk, and interweave its ribs with planks of fir.) (*Aeneid* 2. 10–17)²⁸

Douglas finishes Book I with:

Bot sen thou hast sic plesour and delyte but since such pleasure and
delight

To know our chancis and fal of Troy in weyrknow fates fall war

And schortly the last end tharof wald heir, briefly the final end would
hear

Albeit my spreit abhorris and doth gryß although spirit
shudders

Tharon forto remember and oftsyß remember it and often

Murnand eschewis tharfra with gret dyseyß mourning avoids with great disease

3it than I sal begyn 3ow forto pleyß. yet I will begin to do your bidding

(I. xii. 18–24)

He begins Book II thus:

The Grekis chiftanys, irkit of the weir Greek chieftains weary
war

Bypast or than samony langsum 3eir, lasting so many long tedious years

And oft rebutyt by fatale destany often repulsed by fateful destiny

Ane huge horß, lyke ane gret hil, in hy horse like a great hill
in haste

Craftely thai wrocht in wirschip of Pallas. craftily they made in honour

(II.i.1–5)

Virgil's arrangement ends Book I with Dido's request and opens Book II with Aeneas reclaiming the narrative, both of the poem itself, but also of the account of the fall of Troy. Douglas's redivision spreads Aeneas across both books: arguably, this increases Aeneas' authority, especially in opposition to Dido, as her *amor* becomes somehow downgraded to 'pleasour and delyte', but also as Aeneas' reluctance to speak is set

against her request, rather than introducing Aeneas' account. This change in book division, like the others, occurs in all the manuscripts (although it is altered in the first surviving print, William Copland's in 1553), suggesting strongly that it is an authorial action. In this case, the change may be connected to Douglas's critique in the first prologue of the favourable treatments of Dido offered by Chaucer and Caxton, and his expressed determination to rebalance that depiction towards Aeneas, as presented in the *Aeneid*. If this is the case, to make that point, Douglas favours faithfulness to Virgil's meaning over his other claim, to be faithful to the text as he finds it.

Critical opinion generally perceives Douglas to be a faithful translator, often to the words of Virgil's text, but also to the spirit of it. What that spirit might be, both of Virgil's text, as well as Douglas's interpretation of it, can be more various. The mid-twentieth-century view is well exemplified by C. S. Lewis and R. G. Austin;²⁹ more recent consideration by James Simpson in particular has proposed a different understanding, although his view, that Douglas reads above all politically, and has no sympathy for Dido at all, has been challenged.³⁰ The presentation of Dido, therefore, is an appropriate place to consider Douglas's techniques.

talibus Aeneas ardentem et torva tuentem

lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat.

illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat

nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur

quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.

tandem corripuit sese atque inimica refugit

in nemus umbriferum, coniunx ubi pristinus illi

respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem.

nec minus Aeneas casu percussus iniquo

prosequitur lacrimis longe et miseratur euntem.

(With such speech amid springing tears Aeneas would soothe away the wrath of the fiery, fierce-eyed queen. She, turning away, kept her looks fixed on the ground and no more changes her countenance as he essays to speak than if she were set in hard flint or Marpesian rock. At length she flung herself away and, still his foe, fled back to the shady grove, where Sychaeus, her lord of former days, responds to her sorrows and gives her love for love. Yet, nonetheless, dazed by her unjust doom, Aeneas attends her with tears afar and pities her as she goes.)

(*Aeneid* VI: 467–76)

With sik wordis Eneas, full of wo,	such	
Set hym to meyb the sprete of Queyn Dido,	appease	spirit
Quhilk, all inflambit, ful of wreth and ire,	which	enflamed
wrath		
With acquart luke glowand hait as fyre	awkward look	glowing
hot as fire		
Maid him to weip and sched furth teris wak.	Made him weep and shed	
forth weak tears		
All fremmytly frawart hym, as he spak,	with animosity	against him
spoke		
Hir eyn fixit apone the grond held sche,	eyes	upon the ground

Moving na mair hir curage, face nor bre,	no more mind face brow
Than scho had bene a statu of marbil stane,	she been
Or a ferm rolk of Mont Marpesyane.	hard rock
Bot finaly, full swyft scho wiskis away,	swiftly she whisks
Aggrevit fled into the darn woddis gray,	distressed secret grey
woods	
Quhar as Sycheus, hir first spow ³ , ful suyr,	where spouse entirely
faithful	
Correspondis to hir desyre and cuyr,	matches her desire and care
Rendring in lufe amouris equiualent.	giving equal love
And, nethele ³ , fast eftir hir furth sprent,	nevertheless quickly after
her ran	
Ene, perplexit of hir sory cace,	Aeneas bewildered by her
sorry case	
And weping gan hir follow a weil lang space,	weeping followed her a
very long way	
Regratand in his mynd, and had piete	regretting pity
Of the distre ³ that movit hir so to fle.	Distress flee

(*Eneados* VI. vii. 90–108)

Even at first glance, Douglas's prolixity is evident. The first two lines, summarizing Aeneas' action, become five: such are the differing natures of Older Scots and Latin. Sometimes, of course, Douglas adds detail, although that is not a particular feature here.

For all his championing of Aeneas, Dido is not reduced. In the extract here, in fact, the two are parallel: Eneas is ‘full of wo’ while Dido is full of ‘wreth and ire’. Although wrath is a sin, and Dido’s anger is problematic, nevertheless she is granted at least the same measure of emotion. The Latin syntax makes her into an object of emotion (*ardentem et torva tuentem*) while Douglas grants her name and rank (Queyn Dido) and draws out the description with a simile (‘With acquart luke glowand hait as fyre’). Moreover, that ‘acquart luke’ is enough to bring Aeneas to tears and thus Douglas gives Dido an agency not granted to her by Virgil directly. Nevertheless, immediately prior to this extract, Douglas also extends Aeneas’ speech, and introduces a punctuating ‘quod he’ to separate Aeneas’ assertion of faith to Dido from his instruction by the gods. As a result, Aeneas’ motives for leaving are given appropriate weight and attention, so that the accusation, hanging over from Chaucer and others, that Aeneas abandons Dido, is refuted firmly if indirectly. Indeed, at the end of the passage here, Douglas even uses that prime Virgilian word—‘piete’ (107)—to describe Aeneas’ feelings: in his response to Dido here, Douglas suggests that Aeneas is being most himself, compassionate, but not contrite, ‘regratand’ her distress but not repenting his actions.

The third figure in this encounter, Sychaeus, also receives significant attention from Douglas: he is ‘ful suyr’, a description that might contrast with both Dido and Aeneas, but he is a match for Dido, for he ‘corespondis’ to her, and is equal to her in emotion. That equality identifies him clearly as Dido’s true mate, and possibly distinguishes him from Aeneas, a better match even in the afterlife. Sychaeus also remains still in this passage, in contrast to the others. In Douglas’s expansion, Dido, in particular, moves from absolute stillness, like the Marpesian rock, to speedy departure, inherent in the

‘wiskis’ as well as the ‘fled’. Like the reader, Aeneas is a witness to the stillness, but then runs in pursuit—responsive rather than proactive. The overall effect of Douglas’s translation here is that the reader acknowledges the rightness of Aeneas’ actions while viewing sympathetically Dido’s legitimate fury.

While Dido is a touchstone for his reading of the *Aeneid*, Douglas also responds to other narratives. His redaction of Nisus and Euryalus in Book 9 retains tension and pathos. This extract is taken from the end of their raid, when they are trapped by a Rutulian party in the forest.

nihil illi tendere contra,
sed celerare fugam in silvas et fidere nocti.
obiciunt equites sese ad divortia nota
hinc atque hinc omnemque abitum custode coronant.
silva fuit late dumis atque ilice nigra
horrida, quam densi complebant undique sentes;
rara per occultos lucebat semita calles.
Euryalum tenebrae ramorum onerosaque praeda
impediunt fallitque timor regione viarum.

(They essay no response, but speed their flight to the wood and trust to night. On this side and that the horsemen bar the well-known crossways, and with sentinels girdle every outlet. The forest spread wide with shaggy thickets and dark ilex; dense briers filled it on every side; here and there glimmered the path through the

hidden glades. Euryalus is hampered by the shadowy branches and the burden of his spoil, and fear misleads him in the line of the paths.) (*Aeneid* 9. 377–85)

The tother twa maid nane ansuer agane,	the other two did not reply
Bot in the woddis hyis at the flicht	but fled into the woods
Assurit gretly in the dirknes of the nycht.	trusting
The horsmen than prekis, and fast furth sprentis forward	spurred on and sprang
To weil beknawin pethis, and turnys wentis change direction	well-known paths
Baith heir and thar; sone ombeset haue thai	soon they have covered
The owtgatis all, thai suld nocht wyn away. should not get away	all escape routes—they
The wod was large, and rowch of buskis ronk,	rough with dense bushes
And of the blak ayk schaddowis dym and donk,	black oak damp
Of breris ful, and thyk thorn ronnyys stent— out	briars thick bushes spread
Scarsly a strait rod or dern narow went place	straight road narrow hiding
Tharin mycht fundyn be that men mycht paß men pass	that might be found to let
Quharthrou Eurialus gretly cummyrrit was;	as a result distressed
Quhat for myrknes, thik buskis, branch and breir,	darkness bushes

And weght also of the new spul l yeit geir,	weight	stolen gear
Tharto the hasty onset and affray	fast attack	
Maid hym gang will in the onknawin way.	made him go in the unknown	

(*Eneados* IX. vii. 22–38)

Again, Douglas's rendition is longer than his source text. In stating 'thai suld nocht wyn away', he makes explicit what is implied in Virgil's text, and might thus be argued to render the narrative pedestrian. At the same time, however, his extension of the burdens pressing Euryalus enhances the tension. Euryalus' burdens, 'myrknes, thik buskis, branch and breir | and weght also of the new spulyeit geir', grow in their seriousness. At root, this has to do with the amplification of space, first a word, then a short phrase, then an entire line, so each becomes more influential. Arguably, Douglas does this twice in the passage, first with the attacking soldiers, largely evident by the expanding clauses dependent on the verbs, 'prekis', 'sprentis', and 'turnis'. However, the full effect is not felt until the focus is on Euryalus. The alliteration of 'buskis, branch and breir', as well as being characteristic of Older Scots verse, also implies the tangled nature of woodland, and further distinguishes between the dark and the spoil as handicaps. That the 'geir' has a line to itself changes the weighting of '-que', but in so doing, Douglas forces its significance. He also foregrounds knowledge and the problems facing the interlopers: the 'onknawin way' (38) contrasts with the 'weil beknawin pethis' (26). While Douglas is not able to reproduce Virgil's dense tension in Older Scots, he can and does play to the strengths of his vernacular tradition to represent Virgil's narrative.

The Thirteenth Book

Having accepted Vegio's violent command to translate Virgil's poem (Prol. XIII. 146–52; see discussion p. 000), Douglas then presents his translation of Vegio's own Latin text. He suggests that his own poetic skill will render distinctions between his source texts indistinct ('I speke na wers than I haue doyn befor' (Prol. XIII. 194)). Cummings argues that Douglas is largely faithful to Vegio's text, in much the same way as he is engaged with Virgil's. Given that Vegio reuses Virgilian language and tropes to recast Aeneas as a lover and Lavinia as a plausible replacement for Dido, there is less difference in the texture of the additional book from what might be expected.³¹ To illustrate this, here are extracts from the conversation between Jove and Venus from *Eneados* I and *Eneados* XIII:

Smylyng sum deil, the fader of goddis and men	smiling a little bit
With that ilk sweit vissage, as we ken,	sweet face
as we know	
That mesys tempestis and makis the hevynnis cleir,	calms
First kyssit his child, syne said on this maneir:	kissed then
manner	
'Away sik dreid, Cytherea, be nocht efferd	dread not afraid
For thi lynage onchangit remanys the werd.	lineage unchanged
fate	
As thou desyris, the cite salt thou se,	desires city shall
you see	
And of Lavyne the promyst wallis hie.	Lavinium
promised high	

Eik thou salt ray³ abuf the sterrit sky also shall raise
above starry

The manfull Eneas and hym deify.

(*Eneados* I. v. 47–56)

Olli hominum sator atque deum dedit oscula ab alto

Pectore verba ferens: ‘Quantum, Cytherea, potentem

Aeneam Aeneadasque omnes infessus amavi

Et terra et pelago et per tanta pericula vectos,

Nosti, et saepe equiden indolui commotus amore,

Nata, tuo.

(The father of men and gods kissed her and from his inmost heart spoke: ‘From my very words, goddess of Cythera, you knew how much I have always loved stalwart Aeneas and all his followers, as they fared though such great perils whether on land or on sea, and, touched by your love, my child, indeed I grieved for them time and again.’)³²

(Vegio, *Aeneidos* XIII. 606–11)

The fader tho of men and goddis all

Gan ky³ Venus hys child, and tharwithall kiss

Thir profound wordis from hys breist furth braid: these broke forth from his
breast

‘My deir doughtir Citherea,’ he said, dear daughter

‘Thou knowys quhou strangely the mychty Ene	knows how strongly the
mighty Aeneas	
And the Eneadanys all of hys men ³ e	company
Ithandly and onyrkyt luffyt haue I,	constantly untiringly loved
On se and landis catchit by and by	sea caught
In perrellis seir, and quhou that offtyme eik,	great perils how often each
Havand piete of the my douchtir meik,	having pity on you
For lufe of the, for thar dysey ³ was wo;’	their disease was grief.

(*Eneados* XIII. xi. 29–39)

In these short excerpts, there are repeating phrases, such as ‘fader of goddis and men’ and ‘fader ... of men and goddis all’, ‘kyssit his child’ and ‘gan kyss his child’. Douglas’s use of ‘douchtir’ twice in Jupiter’s speech in the second extract, further emphasizes the family relationship, and implicitly Aeneas’ relationship to the gods. It slightly overplays Vegio’s *nata*; no such insertion appears in the translation from Virgil. Overall, of course, the similarity in tone and presentation of these sections owes much to Vegio’s respectful pastiche of Virgil. For that reason, it is not surprising that Douglas does not noticeably modify his lexical choices or his style for his treatment of Vegio’s material. Vegio, rather, is Douglas’s challenger in representing Virgilian style and themes.

Circulation and Transmission

The *Eneados* found an audience of careful vernacular readers soon after its completion.

Five complete manuscripts survive, with fragments of a sixth, all of which date from

between 1513 and 1553, when the first printed edition appeared in London.³³ A study of the variants suggests that there were more copies than this: Bennett estimates that there must have been at least ten manuscripts, not a bad record over forty years of a very lengthy text.³⁴ The most significant witness is the manuscript written by Douglas's secretary, Matthew Geddes, containing commentary notes discussed above.³⁵ This manuscript (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS Gale 0.3.12) was probably completed no later than 1515. Another copy is also early: now Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library MS Dk.7.49, the Elphynstone manuscript was written before 1527. The others are later: one is dated by its scribe John Mudy to 1545 (London, Lambeth Palace, MS 117), another to 1547 by its scribe Henry Aytoun, notary public (the Bath MS: Warminster, Longleat House, MS IX.D.54), and the last is undated (the Ruthven MS: Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library, MS Dc.1.43). All five manuscripts have an originally Scottish provenance: either the scribes are identified as Scottish or the first recorded owners are. It is possible to imagine family transmission: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS Gale 0.3.12 is obviously closely associated with Douglas himself, while Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library, MS Dc.1.43 may have passed through the hands of Douglas's niece, an illegitimate daughter of the 6th Earl of Angus. John Mudy associates himself with Master Thomas Bellenden, Justice Clerk (d. 1546), the elder brother of the poet John Bellenden, who had close Douglas connections. The Bath MS and the Elphynstone MS do not have obvious links to the Douglasses; instead, they demonstrate the breadth of the text's circulation, for the Elphynstone MS has ownership marks from Aberdeenshire (William Hay, parson of Turriff, Aberdeenshire (1527), and David Anderson, burgess of Aberdeen (1563)), while the Bath MS has been at the other end of

the island from the mid-sixteenth century. While the Scottish provenance of the surviving manuscripts in itself is not surprising, the text's circulation, namely when and in what form did it travel south to England, prior to the first print, is less clear.

In one way, the answer is obvious if not demonstrable: Douglas asserts that he wishes his work to be read throughout 'Albion' and we might easily presume that he took a copy of the poem with him to England and that it might have circulated around his acquaintances and associates there. It should be noted, however, that when he went to England in 1521, he would have expected his stay to be temporary, possibly not even as long as nine months, so that direct and obvious route may not in fact have operated. While the border between Scotland and England was porous, even in the midst of hostilities, and there were numerous people who could have carried Douglas's work south, notwithstanding Douglas's stated hopes for his work, there is no evidence of Douglas's active engagement in its circulation. As a scholar and a translator, he was entirely familiar and comfortable with using printed texts himself; his friend, John Mair, had many printed books to his name. Douglas identifies at least part of his audience as schoolmasters, and grammar books were a key part of early print culture.³⁶ Yet there is no evidence that Douglas sought to have the *Eneados* printed. There are deducible practical reasons why not. First, although there had been vernacular printing in Scotland in the early years of the sixteenth century, Chepman and Myllar had ceased their operations by 1513. Secondly, continental printers, including Badius Ascensius, did not in general print material in insular vernaculars. This was very much the preserve of printers in England, and also indeed Scotland, for Chepman and Myllar's only surviving Latin endeavour is the *Aberdeen Breviary*, a patriotic project if ever there was one. So

Douglas's connections with Paris would have been of no use in bringing the *Eneados* to a wider audience. As a result, therefore, Douglas would have had to put forward his work to be printed in England, had he so wished. It remains possible that he was hostile to the idea of his own work in print, but that seems at odds with his identification of schoolmasters as a particular audience. Had Douglas desired to see his work in print, however, his circumstances probably meant that it was not a priority for him to make it happen.

Nevertheless, the *Eneados* did circulate south of the border, and was accessible to Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, around 1539–40, the likeliest date for his own translation.³⁷ It is interesting to note that there survive fragments of a print of Douglas's other work, *The Palice of Honoure*, by the Scots printer Thomas Davidson, dating c.1530–40.³⁸ While it would not have been beyond Davidson's capabilities to have produced a volume as large as the *Eneados*, and his productions did circulate in England, the possibility that he might also have printed the *Eneados* must remain a tantalizing speculation.³⁹ However Surrey received the *Eneados* (Ridley succinctly traces a possible line of transmission), he certainly used it and referred to it while making his own translation.⁴⁰ Although he is not a slavish imitator, substituting his innovative blank verse for the couplets, and maintaining the standard book division at the beginning of Book II, his debt to Douglas is visible in word choice and phrasing. For instance, describing Dido's first sight of the Trojans leaving Carthage, Douglas has:

Be this Aurora, leifand the purpour bed	leaving purple
Of hir lord Titan, heth the erd oursprede	had the earth overspread
With new days licht, and quhen the queyn	light when queen

The first grekyng of the day hes seyn	break has seen
And fra hir hie wyndoys gan espy,	from high windows saw
With bent sail furth caryand, the navy,	carried forth with bent sail
The costis and the schor al desolate	coasts shore
Behaldis eik but owthir schip or bate,	each without either ship or
boat	
Hir fayr quhite breist, thar as scho dyd stand,white breast	
Feil tymys smate scho with hir awyn hand	many times smote she own
And ryvand hir bricht haris petuusly,	tearing her bright hair
piteously	
‘Iupiter’, quod scho, ‘sal he depart, ha, fy!	said shall
And leful tyll a vavengeour stranger	prompt to [the will of] a new
person	
Me and my realm betrump on this maner?’	deceive
(Eneados IV. xi. 1–14)	

Surrey’s equivalent is:

Aurora now from Titans purple bed
 With new day light hath ouerspred the earth
 When by her windowes the Quene the peping day
 Espyed, and nauie with splaid sailes depart
 The shore, and eke the porte of vessels voide:

Her comly brest thrise or foure times she smote

With her own hand, and tore her golden tresse.

Oh Iove (quoth she) shall he then thus depart

A straunger thus, and scorne our kingdome so?⁴¹

As Ridley points out, there are various verbal echoes (‘ouerspred the erd’, ‘her own hand’) that are not traceable to Virgil’s text.⁴² This passage is typical, indicative of a debt rather than a dependence: Surrey’s verse is notably more concise, and his rendition makes Dido less angry and less identified with her realm. Nevertheless, the recurring evidence of this debt makes it significant both in considering Surrey’s work, and also Douglas’s continuing reputation.

Just as Douglas would have wished, the *Eneados* remained a well-known text in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. After its 1553 printing in London, its first Scottish printing was in Edinburgh in 1710 under the guidance of Thomas Ruddiman;⁴³ the prologues, together with Douglas’s other work, *The Palice of Honoure*, were printed in 1787–8, under the imprint of booksellers in Edinburgh and London.⁴⁴ The interest in Older Scots verse and Douglas in particular can be seen in Allan Ramsay’s choice of ‘Gavin Douglas’ as his literary pseudonym. While Ramsay was well known as a writer, editor and publisher of Older Scots, the choice of pseudonym might also refer to Ramsay’s engagement with and reworking of classical Latin poetry, even if for Ramsay it was more Horace than Virgil.⁴⁵ That the *Eneados*—or at least the prologues—continued to circulate in the eighteenth century can be seen in the epigraph to Robert Burns’s mock-epic *Tam o’ Shanter* ‘Of Brownies and Bogills full is this book’, a description of *Eneados* Book VI that Douglas derides.⁴⁶ Burns’s use of the line is suggestive both in readings of

Tam o' Shanter and in readings of the *Eneados*. Douglas goes to some lengths to offer allegorical readings of Book 6 that fit with Christian theology; this phrase, albeit misapplied in Douglas's view, also domesticates and undermines the grandeur of Virgil's vision. While Burns of course is famous for undermining Christian visions of grandeur, that he uses a phrase intended to demonstrate careless reading might suggest that he is hoping for something better for his poem. Both these evocations suggest that the *Eneados* was read with sophistication, certainly in Scotland, but quite possibly in the rest of the British Isles too.

The first scholarly editions appeared in the nineteenth century, beginning with the Bannatyne Club edition in 1839, and then John Small's four-volume edition in 1874.⁴⁷ Small's edition has been long-lasting, but despite its relative accessibility, it is not as robust as Coldwell's edition for the Scottish Text Society. That too is under revision: so much work has been done recently on Douglas and his poetry, especially by Priscilla Bawcutt, but also on the larger culture to which he belonged, in areas such as Virgilian reception, book history, and interplay between different literatures. That work is complemented by the consideration of the work through theories of translation.

Despite all the additional information, however, the *Eneados* remains as an extraordinary piece of work; as a 'vernacular humanist' Douglas was an important conduit between the classical world and his own. The wealth of recent textual and contextual discussion of the *Eneados*, as well as that on the taxonomies of medieval and renaissance, has encouraged a re-engagement with theories of translation and Douglas's self-projection as an author, and as a translator. Although such examination is more advanced in discussion of later translations, the refiguring of the *Eneados* in the light of

such theories is only just beginning.⁴⁸ So far, such work has brought out the continuities between Douglas's practices and Older Scots traditions, both formal and also in authorial attitudes. As it progresses, our understanding of the *Eneados* will become richer, but also more complex and more nuanced, and its position as a significant piece of writing in British literature will be upheld.⁴⁹

¹ See, for example, C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 76–90, esp. pp. 86–8; Christopher Baswell, *Virgil in Medieval England: Figuring the Aeneid from the Twelfth Century to Chaucer* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 276–9.

² For the 5th Earl's career under James III and James IV, see Norman Macdougall, *James III: A Political Study* (Edinburgh, 1981) and Norman Macdougall, *James IV* (East Linton, 1997).

³ See Priscilla Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas: A Critical Study* (Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 1–23; also Priscilla Bawcutt, 'New Light on Gavin Douglas', in *The Renaissance in Scotland: Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture*, eds A. A. MacDonald, M. Lynch, and I. B. Cowan (Leiden, 1994), pp. 95–106. Together with Professor Bawcutt's *Dictionary of National Biography* article, these are the fullest accounts of Douglas's life.

⁴ See Michael Brown, *The Black Douglasses* (East Linton, 2004) for details of the Black Douglas rise and fall; for the Red Douglasses in the sixteenth century, see Jane E. A. Dawson, *Scotland Reformed 1488–1587* (Edinburgh, 2007).

⁵ Robert Cummings, "'To the cart the fift quheill': Gavin Douglas' Humanist Supplement to the *Eneados*", *Translation and Literature* 4:2 (1995), 133–56, esp. 139–41; James Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution, Oxford English Literary History 2: 1350–1547* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 68–72.

⁶ Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas*, p. 4.

⁷ Gavin Douglas, *Virgil's Aeneid*, ed. D. F. C. Coldwell, Scottish Text Society, 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1957–64), 4, 194, 'Heir followys the tyme, space and dait of the translatioun of this buke', ll.

2–4. All references are taken from this edition, and are embedded in the text, in this form: book or prologue number (roman): chapter number (roman): line numbers (arabic). The Scottish Text Society is currently sponsoring a revision of this edition, undertaken by Ian Cunningham and Priscilla Bawcutt, forthcoming. There is also an alternative edition: Gavin Douglas, *The Aeneid (1513)*, ed. Gordon Kendal, 2 vols (2011). This edition has some significant idiosyncrasies: see Sheldon Brammall's review in *Translation and Literature* 21(2012), 235–41.

⁸ Bawcutt believes that Douglas's absence from Scottish records between 1505 and 1509 may be an indication of his presence in Paris. Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas*, p. 28.

⁹ Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas*, pp. 27–9.

¹⁰ John Durkan and Anthony Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries*, Special Issue of *Innes Review* 9:1 (1958), under 'Bishops: William Elphinstone', 31–4 and 'Individuals: Archibald Whitelaw', 159.

¹¹ For modern editions of Vegio, see Maffeo Vegio, *Mapheus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid*, ed. Anna Cox Brinton, (Stanford, Calif., 1930; repr. 2002) and Maffeo Vegio, *Short Epics*, eds and trans. Michael C. J. Putnam with James Hankins (Cambridge, Mass., 2004).

¹² See Douglas, Prol. XIII, 118; David Scott Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 249.

¹³ Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas*, p. 139.

¹⁴ John Bellenden, *Livy's History of Rome—The First Five Books*, ed. W. A. Craigie, Scottish Text Society, 2 vols, 1st ser. 47, 51 (Edinburgh, 1901–3). Comparatively little has been

published about this work, but these are useful: R. J. Lyall, 'Vernacular Prose before the Reformation', in *The History of Scottish Literature 1: Origins to 1660*, ed. R. D. S. Jack (Aberdeen, 1987–8), pp. 163–82; John MacQueen, 'Aspects of Humanism in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Literature', in *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland*, ed. John MacQueen (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 10–31, esp. pp. 11–19; Thomas Rutledge, 'Gavin Douglas and John Bellenden: Poetic Relations and Political Affiliations', in *Langage Cleir Illumynate: Scottish Poetry from Barbour to Drummond, 1375–1630*, ed. Nicola Royan, *Scottish Cultural Review of Literature and Language* 10 (Amsterdam, 2007), pp. 93–116.

¹⁵ For example, *Longer Scottish Poems*, vol. 1, 1375–1650, eds Priscilla Bawcutt and Felicity Riddy (Edinburgh, 1987), has Prologues VII and XIII; *The Poetry of Scotland: Gaelic, Scots and English*, ed. Roderick Watson (Edinburgh, 1995) has Prologues I, VII and XII, with two extracts relating to Dido; and *The New Penguin Book of Scottish Verse*, eds Robert Crawford and Mick Imlah (Harmondsworth, 2000), has Prologues VII and XII.

¹⁶ The Bannatyne Miscellany, first compiled by the Edinburgh merchant George Bannatyne in the mid-sixteenth century, is one of the major manuscript witnesses to Older Scots poetry. For more details, see Theo van Heijnsbergen, 'Bannatyne, George (1545–1607/8)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004); online edn, Oct. 2006 (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1309>), accessed 28 June 2013), and *Bannatyne Manuscript: National Library of Scotland Advocates' MS.1.1.6*, eds Denton Fox and William A. Ringler (1980).

¹⁷ See, among others, Daniel J. Pinti, 'Alter Maro, alter Mapheus: Gavin Douglas' Negotiation of Authority in *Eneados* 13', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993), 323–44; Cummings, 'Gavin Douglas' Humanist Supplement', and A. E. C. Canitz, 'The Prologue to the

Eneados: Gavin Douglas' Directions for Reading', *Studies in Scottish Literature* 25 (1990), 1–22.

¹⁸ See Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance*, pp. 176–8.

¹⁹ This is Cambridge, Trinity College MS Gale 0.3.12. See pp .000–000 for further discussion.

²⁰ Douglas Gray, 'Gavin Douglas', in *A Companion to Older Scots Poetry*, eds P. Bawcutt and J. Hadley Williams (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 149–64 (at pp. 160–1).

²¹ See Pinti, 'Gavin Douglas' Negotiation of Authority', Cummings, 'Gavin Douglas' Humanist Supplement', and Kantik Ghosh, "'The Fift Quheill": Gavin Douglas' Maffeo Vegio', *Scottish Literary Journal* 22:1 (1995), 5–21.

²² Prologue XIII evokes Henryson's encounter with Aesop in the Prologue to *The Lion and the Mouse*, and the description of Vegius is very close to Henryson's description of Mercury in *The Testament of Cresseid*, also an unreliable recorder of events.

²³ Priscilla Bawcutt, 'Gavin Douglas and the Text of Virgil', *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 4 (1996–8), 213–31. For more information on Badius, see Paul White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius: Commentary, Commerce and Print in the Renaissance* (Oxford, 2013).

²⁴ These notes are taken from the notes to Coldwell's Scottish Text Society edition, revised by Ian Cunningham. I am grateful to Mr Cunningham for allowing me to use the material before publication.

²⁵ This again is taken from Ian Cunningham's revisions to Coldwell's notes.

²⁶ White, *Jodocus Badius Ascensius*, pp. 207–33.

²⁷ Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance*, pp. 36–7.

²⁸ All quotations from and translations of the *Aeneid* are taken from Virgil, *Aeneid*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), slightly modernized.

²⁹ R. G. Austin, *Some English Translations of Virgil: An Inaugural Lecture* (Liverpool, 1956), pp. 16–17; Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 76–90.

³⁰ Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Reformation*, pp. 89–92. For critique of this view, see Priscilla Bawcutt, ‘Writing about Love in Late Medieval Scotland’, in *Writing on Love in the English Middle Ages*, ed. Helen Cooney (Gordonville, Va, 2006), pp. 179–96, esp. pp. 192–3. On Surrey as translator of Virgil, see also Chapter 28 in this volume by Simpson.

³¹ Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance*, pp. 235–47.

³² Text and translation from Maffeo Vegio, *Short Epics*, ed. and trans. Putnam, pp. 38–9.

³³ For a full account of the witnesses of the *Eneados*, see Coldwell I, pp. 118–27.

³⁴ J. A. W. Bennett, ‘The Early Fame of Gavin Douglas’ *Eneados*’, *Modern Language Notes* 61:2 (1946), 83–8, esp. p. 84.

³⁵ See pp. 000–0. Some editors of the poem have stated that these commentary notes are in Douglas’s own hand, but Bawcutt believes that they are in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, although composed by Douglas. See Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas*, p. 108.

³⁶ The Scottish grammarian John Vaus is a case in point: he published *Rudimenta puerorum in artem grammaticam* with Badius in 1523.

³⁷ See *The Aeneid of Henry Howard, Early of Surrey*, ed. Florence H. Ridley (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), introduction, pp. 13–30.

³⁸ See *The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas*, ed. Priscilla Bawcutt, rev. edn, Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh, 2003), pp. xv–xvi. The fragments are now Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library, De.6.123.

³⁹ Thomas Davidson printed John Bellenden’s *Chronicles of Scotland* (c.1535), a translation of Hector Boece, *Scotorum historia* (Paris, 1527): that text was a major source for the Scottish narrative in ‘Holinshed’s’ *Chronicles*. For the suggestion that Davidson’s print of *The Palice*

of *Honoure* may lie behind Copland's 1553 print, see William Beattie, 'Fragments of the Palyce of Honour', *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 3 (1951), 33–46.

Professor Bawcutt is my authority for this speculation, in private correspondence and discussion. Her full account will appear in the revised Scottish Text Society edition of the *Eneados*, currently in preparation.

⁴⁰ Ridley, *The Aeneid of Henry Howard*, pp. 28–30, says that although none of the surviving is Surrey's crib, it seems most likely that he used one closely related to Cambridge, Trinity College MS Gale 0.3.12. On Surrey see also Chapter 28 in this volume by Simpson.

⁴¹ *The Aeneid of Henry Howard*, IV, 780–8, ed. Ridley, pp. 149–50.

⁴² *The Aeneid of Henry Howard*, ed. Ridley, p. 29. The text of her edition highlights all points of similarity between Douglas's translation and Surrey's.

⁴³ *Virgil's Æneis: translated into Scottish verse, by . . . Gawin Douglas . . . A new edition. Wherein the many errors of the former are corrected, . . . To which is added a large glossary, . . . And to the whole is prefix'd an exact account of the author's life and writings* (Edinburgh, 1710).

⁴⁴ The full title is this: Gavin Douglas, *Select works of Gawin Douglass: . . . Containing Memoirs of the author, The palice [sic] of honour, Prologues to the Æneid, and a glossary of obsolete words; To which is added, an old poem, author unknown* (Perth, 1787). The work was reprinted the following year.

⁴⁵ See Michael Murphy, 'Allan Ramsay as an Imitator of Horace', *Études écossaises* 2 (1993), 123–9.

⁴⁶ See Robert Burns, *Tam o' Shanter: A Tale* in Robert Burns, *Poems and Songs*, ed. James Kinsley (Oxford, 1969), number 321, p. 443.

⁴⁷Gavin Douglas, *Aeneid of Virgil Translated into Scottish verse by Gawin Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld*, ed. George Dundas, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1839) and Gavin Douglas, *The Poetical Works of Gavin Douglas*, ed. J. Small, 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1874).

⁴⁸For seminal discussion of texts slightly later than the *Eneados*, see David Hopkins, *Conversing with Antiquity: English Poets and the Classics, from Shakespeare to Pope* (Oxford, 2010); for preliminary discussion of Douglas in this context, see Antony J. Hasler, *Court Poetry in Late Medieval England and Scotland: Allegories of Authority* (Cambridge, 2011), esp. pp. 87–8, and Thomas Rutledge, ‘Gavin Douglas and John Bellenden: Poetic Relations and Political Affiliations’, in *Langage Cleir Illumynate*, ed. Nicola Royan, pp. 93–116.

⁴⁹I would like to thank Priscilla Bawcutt, Rita Copeland, Charles Martindale, and David Hopkins for their detailed and very helpful reading of this chapter.